

Bryan Rome, Granby,

I oppose HB 6355 as it would serve to further dissuade those who need help the most from seeking it and is of dubious constitutionality. I'll begin by quickly making two points which I believe could work to curb suicides in our state.

By instead making conversations between a patient and some medical professionals (like family practitioners and nurses) regarding self harm absolutely privileged, requiring patient consent before relaying to other parties, I believe that we will see people who might have otherwise stayed silent step forward and receive the help they need, without fear of government intervention.

I would instead recommend seeking to collaborate with NPOs like HoldMyGuns, who work to establish a network of FFLs willing to temporarily house firearms offered by firearm owners on their own volition. Who then may regain their firearms at anypoint after passing a background check.

This law cross-sections the rights acknowledged by the state's declaration of rights and the amendments to our federal constitution. It has already been argued that this infringes on the second amendment and due process, I would like to raise a point to showcase the issue of just how many rights are impacted. Section 11 of the declaration of rights reads "The property of no person shall be taken for public use, without just compensation therefor." I believe that a compelling argument exists that public safety would fall under the umbrella of public use. The state should offer compensation to those who have a RPO applied to them for the period of time that their assets are being held for this public use. This is by no means the most important constitutional issue but is one not raised yet.

Ultimately freedom and security are antithetical. Absolute freedom can not be achieved when we possess absolute security. And absolute security can not be achieved when we possess absolute freedom. We must find a balance between the two. And I fall on the side of greater liberty.

On HB 6491 I would quickly like to state that on my Massachusetts college campus I have heard of people who carried electronic defense weapons (as firearms are not allowed on campus) and personally know a coworker who is willing to practice self-defense but takes moral issue with the lethal force of a firearm.

This concludes my statement.